

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached drawing sheets include changes to FIG. 3. These sheets of drawings replace the original sheets. In FIG. 3, reference numeral "92" has been added as requested by the Examiner.

Attachments: One Replacement Sheet Depicting FIG. 3
 One Annotated Sheet Highlighting Changes to FIG. 3

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action mailed June 16, 2006. Claims 1-16 remain pending in the application prior to this amendment and stand rejected. Claims 1-4, 8, 10-13 and 16 have been amended herein, and claims 5-7, 9, 14 and 15 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to for failing to indicate reference numeral 92 recited in the Specification. The drawings have been amended to add reference numeral 92 to FIG. 3. A marked up drawing, showing the changes made to FIG. 3, and a corrected formal drawing are submitted herewith for review and approval by the Examiner. Pending the Examiner's approval, Applicant respectfully requests that the amendment to the drawings be entered and the objections be withdrawn.

Amendments to the Specification

The Examiner noted that the trademark LYCRA has been used in the Specification and has requested an alternative indication thereof. The Specification has been amended herein to denote the trademark LYCRA, as requested.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, with

respect to the recitation of "first frusto-conically shaped protrusion", "second frusto-conically shaped protrusion", "second recess", "second liquid discharge passage", and "second plurality of air discharge passages", in claims 1, 9, 15 and 16. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and directs the Examiner to the Specification at page 14, lines 8-17 and FIGS. 2 and 5. Specifically, the Specification states:

[i]t will also be recognized that, while the exemplary embodiment has been described above with respect to a nozzle having one liquid discharge passage extending through a frustoconical protrusion, the nozzle may alternatively have multiple liquid discharge passages extending through respective frustoconical protrusions. For example, the nozzle may have two liquid discharge passages, as depicted in FIGS. 2 and 5, each extending through a frustoconical protrusion and having associated air discharge passages. Alternatively, a nozzle may have 3, 4, 5, 6, or even more liquid discharge passages.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Specification sets forth the features recited in the claims in sufficient detail and respectfully requests that these rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

Claims 15 and 16 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, with respect to the recitation of "a base." Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and asserts that the term "base" is sufficiently disclosed in the Specification. In particular, Applicant directs the Examiner to the Specification at page 2, lines 8-14; page 4, lines 7-9; and page 11, lines 1-3. Each of these sections of the Specification discusses a protrusion having a base, as recited in the claims. Claim 15 was canceled and the subject matter of claim 15 was incorporated into claim 16, which has been rewritten in independent form. Claim 16 was further amended to be consistent with the

language of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-4, 8 and 15 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,969,602 to Scholl. Claim 15 was canceled, as discussed above. Claim 1 is the only remaining independent claim of this rejected group and is directed to a nozzle for discharging at least one liquid filament onto a moving substrate. Claim 1 has been amended herein to recite "a plurality of frusto-conically shaped protrusions" and "a plurality of liquid discharge passages." Support for these amendments can be found with reference to FIGS. 1 and 2. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by these amendments.

Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Scholl '602. Specifically, Scholl '602 is directed to a nozzle attachment for an adhesive dispensing device, wherein "[t]he nozzle attachment is a one-piece annular plate which is mounted by a cap or nut to a nozzle of the gun body." (Scholl '602 at col. 3, lines 60-63.) Scholl '602 does not teach or suggest a nozzle body having plural frusto-conically shaped protrusions and liquid discharge passages, as set forth in claim 1.

Claims 2-4 and 8 each depend from independent claim 1 and are therefore in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 2-4, and 8 have been amended herein so that the claim language is consistent with the amendments to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the

rejections of claim 1-4 and 8 over Scholl '602 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,435,425 to Saidman. Claim 15 was canceled in favor of rewriting claim 16 in independent form. Claim 16 was further amended to be consistent with the language of claim 1. Claims 1 and 16 are the only independent claims of this rejected group. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1 and 16 because Saidman '425 does not teach or suggest "frusto-conically shaped protrusions on said second side" of a nozzle body, as set forth in these claims. Rather, Saidman '425 is directed to a module and nozzle for dispensing patterns of liquid material wherein nozzles 30, 130 include one or more "wedge-shaped members" 42, 142. These wedge-shaped members are not frusto-conically shaped protrusions. Moreover, the objective of Saidman '425 was to develop a meltblown-style applicator that uses wedge-shaped members instead of protrusions. (See Saidman '425 at col. 1, line 38 – col. 2, line 10.) For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1 and 16 over Saidman '425 be withdrawn.

Claims 5-7, 9, and 14 have been canceled. Claims 2-4, 8, and 10-13 each depend from independent claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-4, 8, and 10-13 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims over Saidman '425 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments to the specification and claims, and the remarks set forth herein, Applicant believes this case is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes any issue requires further discussion, the Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone the undersigned attorney so that the matter may be promptly resolved. The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is appreciated.

Applicant believes that no fees are due as a result of this amendment. If any charges or credits are necessary to complete this communication, please apply them to Deposit Account No. 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.

By: /David W. Dorton/
David W. Dorton, Reg. No. 51,625

2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, OH 45202
(513) 241-2324 (voice)
(513) 241-6234 (facsimile)

